DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 010 PS 025 225

AUTHOR Russell, Alan; Saebel, Judith
TITLE Individual Differences in Parent-Child Play Styles: Their Nature and Possible Consequences.
SPONS AGENCY Australian Research Council.
PUB DATE Apr 97
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (62nd, Washington, DC, April 3-6, 1997).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *Individual Differences; Parent Attitudes; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Influence; Peer Relationship; *Play; *Toddlers
IDENTIFIERS *Play Style

ABSTRACT

This study examined individual differences in parent-child play styles and their links with children's play behavior with peers. Mothers and fathers were videotaped playing with their toddler in toy play and physical play, and completed a project-designed questionnaire on their beliefs about child development. Children were observed separately in a free-play session with peers. Parental play behavior was classified using three general codes of Director (controlling and directing), Facilitator (child-centered and facilitative), and Co-player (joint or co-constructed play). The child's enjoyment of the parent-child play was also coded. During the free-play session, ratings were made of social and play behaviors such as sociability, cheerfulness, negativity to peers, pretend play, and turn taking. Findings indicated that the facilitator style was used most often in toy play and the director style was used most often in physical play. A profile of the specific behaviors associated with the director and the facilitator style was identified. Links were noted between parental play styles and children's play behaviors with parents and with peers. The facilitator style was associated with children displaying more "fun" in play with peers. (Contains 21 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 010

Individual differences in parent-child play styles: Their nature and possible consequences[1]

Alan Russell
Judith Saebel
The Flinders University of South Australia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ABSTRACT

Individual differences in parent-child play styles were examined and their links with children's play behavior with peers explored. The main emphasis was on the social aspects of both parent-child play and child play with peers. The broad aim was to contribute to the understanding of links between the family and peer systems. Parents (mothers and fathers) were observed playing with their toddler-aged child in toy play and physical play, and completed a questionnaire on their beliefs about child development. Children were separately observed in a free-play session with peers. Parental play behavior was classified using three general codes of Director, Facilitator, and Co-player, and a number of specific behaviors were coded. Aspects of child behavior during the play also were coded. The facilitator style was used most in toy play and the director style most in physical play. A profile of the specific behaviors associated with the director style and with the facilitator style was identified from the results. Links were noted between parental play styles and children's play behaviors with parents and with peers. The facilitator style was associated with children displaying more "fun" in play with peers. Issues about the mechanisms involved in links between parent play styles and child play behaviors with peers were considered.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Alan Russell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Washington , DC, April 1997

[1] The research reported here was supported by a grant from the Australian Research Council to A. Russell, G. Pettit, and J. Mize.

PS 025225

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper examines individual differences in parent-child play styles and explores links between parent-child play and children's play behavior with peers. The main emphasis is on the social aspects of both parent-child play and child play with peers, i.e. the behavioral style of parent and child during play. Broadly, the research aims to contribute to the understanding of links between the family and peer systems (Parke & Ladd, 1992; Mize & Pettit, 1997).

The conceptualization of differences in parent-child play styles used in the present research drew on the general literature about differences in parenting styles and parent-child relationships. One stylistic difference concerns the degree to which parents are intrusive, controlling, directing, or parent-centered (Jennings & Connors, 1989; Rose-Krasnor, Rubin, Booth, & Coplan, 1996; Russell & Russell, 1996). Parents high on this style tend to impose their own "agenda" on the child, are "in charge" of the play, and could be described as parent-centered. Another stylistic difference concerns the degree to which parents are responsive or sensitive to the child's needs. Parents high on this could be described as child-centered in their approach. The child-centered style is well captured in The Child's Game, where the play style that parents are encouraged to use involves following the child's lead (Parpal & Maccoby, 1985).

A third stylistic difference, where the parent and child participate more equally in a peer-like set of interactions also has been considered recently. This style lies between being parent-centered and child-centered. Parent-child play of this third type could be described as joint or co-constructed, with the parental role as that of "co-player (Goncu, 1987; O' Reilly & Bornstein, 1993; Russell, 1996; Russell, Pettit, & Mize, in preparation). This style is especially suited to play, where parents can contribute to the play in a peer-like way, for example, by encouraging reciprocity of actions and emotions and by sharing the power to influence the play themes or content.

There are several ways that children's experiences in the play context with parents might be influential in the acquistion of behaviors used in interacting with peers. Each of the play styles outlined above could be influential. For example, direct parental instructions about play and social behavior could assist the child in learning play skills. Alternatively, however, directiveness could be intrusive and inhibit children's acquistion of play and social skills. The child-centered style, in turn, could assist children to develop confidence and esteem in their own abilities as a play and social interaction partner, and encourage them to develop their own skills further, by granting autonomy to the child and being positive to the child's efforts and behavior. Finally, the co-player style could allow children to experience a play context parallel to a peer-context in many ways, and therefore provide opportunities to have behaviors modeled, and to practice behaviors relevant to the play context with peers. If this kind of modeling and practice occurs, it might be expected that there would be parallels between some specific play behaviors used by the parent and child during play, and the behaviors the child uses in interactions with peers i.e. a direct carry-over from the parent-child context to the peer-peer context. Furthermore, it might be expected that during parent and child play there would be specific parallels in the behavior of parent and child, indicative of a degree of equality.

It can be seen that the present research was somewhat exploratory, recognizing that there are likely to be a number of possible ways that children's experiences in play with their parents might be linked to their play behavior and competencies with peers.

Both mothers and fathers were observed in play with their children, so that an additional component of the research outlined here involves possible differences in how experiences with mothers and with fathers are linked to children's play behavior and competencies. Previous research (Kerns & Barth, 1995; McDonald & Parke, 1984; Parke, Cassidy, Burks, & Carson, 1992) has suggested that there could be

differences in mother and fathers contributions to children's development of peer competencies.

Method

Subjects

The present paper is based on a subsample of 51 families for whom coding has been completed from a larger study. The subjects were mothers and fathers with a toddler-aged child (mean age of 2.2 years, range 2.0 to 2.5; 27 boys and 24 girls). The mean age of fathers was 35.3 years (SD = 4.66), and of mothers was 32.4 years (SD = 4.20). All fathers were employed (47 full-time), and 2 mothers were employed full-time and 26 part-time. There was an average of 2.1 children in the families, and most of the families were in the low to middle income range (60% of families had a family income of between AUS $25, 000 and $55, 000; about US $20, 000 to $44, 000).

Procedure

Observations (videotaped) of parent-child play (mother and father) were completed in the home. There were two play periods, lasting 9 mins each. The first period involved toy play and the second physical play. The toys, provided by the researchers, involved people, farm animals, planes, trucks, and household furniture. Props provided for the physical play consisted of a large inflated ball and 2 large hand puppets. The parents were asked to play as they normally would with the child. Mothers and fathers completed questionnaires on their beliefs about children and childrearing. Children also were observed in a free-play context while attending "Playgroup" (an organised small group in which parents of preschool children meet and provide play opportunities for the children).

Coding of parent-child play

General parental play style: Three codes were developed to capture the overall play style of the parents: whether the parent was largely in control and directing the play (the director style), whether the parent was child-centered and facilitative (the facilitator style), and whether the parent and child engaged in joint or co-constructed play (the co-player style). The play periods were divided into three time segments for the coding of general style: 1st min, mins 2-5, and mins 6-9. Coders first indicated the presence or absence of each of the general styles in the time segment. They then ranked the prominence of each of the three styles, using the rankings of 1, 2, and 3, although it was possible to rank two or more styles equally. A ranking of 1 indicated that the particular style was prominent in the parent's behavior. Often, the first ranked style was the main style used by the parent, but at times 2, or even 3 styles could receive a ranking of 1. One other general code was used, namely, the child's enjoyment of the play, conceptualized as the extent to which the child showed

positive spontaneous bouts of behavior. The child's enjoyment was scored using a 5-point scale.

Specific play behaviors: A number of additional codes were used to rate observed behavior, again using 5-point scales. These have been set out in Tables 3 and 4. Most of the behaviors concerned the parent, but child behaviors and joint behaviors also were coded. For the coding of the specific behaviors, the play periods were divided into five time segments, to allow more detailed analyses. These were: 1st min, mins 2-3, mins 4-5, mins 6-7, and mins 8-9.

Reliability: Two trained graduate students were used as coders. Following training, the first 17 families were coded by both coders. Agreement between coders in whether each of the play styles was present or not during the time segment was calculated using intraclass correlation procedure proposed by Rae (1984). These yielded agreements of between .5 and .6, with the lowest (.55) for co-player. Second, reliability in the use of the rating scales was calculated using Finn's r. The reliabilities for the general codes were: director role (.72), facilitator role (.72), co-player role (.66), and child's enjoyment (.86). We interpret these results as showing that when each of the play styles is reasonably prominent, they can be identified and rated relatively reliably, but that some parent-child play is difficult to classify in terms of one or other style. The reliabilities for the specific codes were all above .73, and generally were above .80, indicating good reliabilities for the relatively specific behavioral codes.

Coding of child-peer play

Children were observed under conditions of spontaneous peer play at Playgroup, a setting where a small group of parents and children (typically less than about 15 in number) meet and provide play opportunities for the children. Observations of the play were made for about 1 hour, and then ratings of social and play behaviors were made on a total of 32 scales. The scales included social behaviors such as: sociability, cheerfulness, boisterous/noisy, negativity to peers, undirected aggression, being an onlooker, and assertiveness, as well as play behaviors such as: engaging in outdoor play, engaging in pretend play, engaging in turn taking interactions, and engaging in fine motor play.

Parental beliefs

Parents completed a questionnaire about aspects of their beliefs. It included questions about how important the parent believed that it was for a child about their child's age to show certain social behaviors (11 items) or play skills (5 items). The social behaviors included being sociable and friendly, being able to share, and being able to take turns. The play skills included being able to engage in pretend play, and being able to engage in construction play.

Results

Rates of parental play styles

Table 1 gives the rates (over the 3 time segments) at which the three general parental styles (a) were observed to be present in the play during the coding period, and (b) were ranked as being prominent during the coding period, for mothers and fathers, and for each type of play. The facilitator style was present the most and ranked as most prominent, followed by the director style. The co-player style was observed in less than 30% of the time segments, and was ranked as prominent generally in less than 10% of the time segments.

The minimum scores for the presence and prominence data in Table 1 were in all cases zero, indicating that each of the three styles were never used by some mothers and fathers in both toy play and physical play. The maximum scores for presence were one in the case of the director and facilitator styles, indicating that there were some parents who displayed these styles in each of the time segments, and some parents for whom these two styles were prominent in each time segment. The maximum score for the co-player style was not always one, showing that few parents used this style in all three of the time segments.

Separate analyses (within-subject ANOVAs) with mothers and fathers, time, and type of play as factors were conducted on the presence and on the prominence data for each play style. These analyses showed no differences between mothers and fathers. However, the director style was present more in physical play than toy play ($F(1, 50) = 43.24$, $p < .001$), and was ranked as prominent more often ($F(1, 50) = 41.42$, $p < .001$) in physical play. The facilitator style was present more in toy play than physical play ($F(1, 50) = 10.26$, $p < .01$) and also ranked as more prominent in toy play ($F(1, 50) = 30.53$, $p < .001$). There was no evidence of differences in the use of director, faciltator, or co-player across the three time segments within either toy or physical play.

Combinations of parental play styles

The data were examined to determine whether the general parental play styles were used individually or in combination, and how their use changed over the three time segments in the play. These results are given in Table 2. It can be seen that the most typical pattern was for director and facilitator styles to occur together in a time segment. Co-player occurred little as the only style in a given time segment. The co-player style sometimes occurred with the director style, but appeared more likely to occur with the facilitator style, or to occur as part of a pattern involving all three styles. The presence of all three styles together became more likely after the first minute of play. The latter trend seemed to be associated with some reduction in the likelihood of the director and facilitator styles being used alone after the first minute.

Specific behaviors associated with play styles

Tables 3 and 4 contain the results comparing (t tests) the specific behaviors coded during the first minute of play (combining toy play and physical play) for parents who did not use the director style (n= 91) versus parents who used only the director style (n = 47) (Table 3), and for parents who did not use the facilitator style (n = 58) versus parents who used only the facilitator style (n = 70) (Table 4). The findings here are for mothers and fathers combined, but essentially comparable results were obtained when separate analyses were conducted for the results from mothers and from fathers.

It can be seen in Table 3 that parents who used the director style were rated as using more play directives, as being more interactive, and as asking more questions. The "director parents" also were less responsive to the child generally and in response to the child's autonomy, and were rated as responding less positively to children's initiations, and as being less clear in the questions they asked. When parents used the director style, children were rated as initiating less, and as being less accepting in response to parent initiations during the play. There was more conflict between parent and child when the parent used the director style.

Parents who used the facilitator style were rated as being more responsive generally, as more responsive to the child's autonomy, and as being more positive in response to child initiations during the play. The facilitator parents were rated as using play leads and play directives less often, as being less interactive, and as asking questions less. Children of parents who used the facilitator style initiated interactions more, and were more accepting in response to parent initiations during the play. There was less conflict between parent and child when the parent used the facilitator style.

Overall play styles

The data were examined for the degree to which parents were consistent in their style across each of the three time-segments i.e., we were asking about their overall style. The strategy used was to determine first whether some parents used all three styles in each of the coded time segments, i.e. whether the three styles were coded as being present for the parent in each time segment. No parent used the three styles in each time segment. We then determined whether any of the particualr pair-wise combinations of styles were present in each of the time segments. A number of parents consistently used two styles (see Table 5). The remaining results were examined to determine whether a single style was present in each of the time segments. Again, a number of parents were consistent in this way. The results in Table 5 show that there were three main types of overall style: for some parents, the director style was used in each time segment, for other parents it was the facilitator

style, and for a third group of parents it was a combination of the director and facilitator styles.

The overall style was determined for toy play and physical play separately, because, as already noted, the two forms of play tended to be associated with somewhat different play styles (physical play involved more of the director style and toy play involved more of the facilitator style). To illustrate this, two mothers and seven fathers changed from an overall style of facilitator in toy play to an overall style of director in physical play. All other mothers and fathers retained some consistency across the two forms of play, however. For example, the parent could have been classified as "director" in toy play and as "director plus facilator" in physical play.

Analyses (ANOVAs with play type and parent sex as within-subjects factors) were conducted based on the overall play styles classification given in Table 5, investigating the prominence ratings for director, facilitator, and co-player as a function of the overall styles of director, facilitator and director plus facilitator (remember that the overall style classification was based on the observed presence of each style). Each of these analyses yielded significant results for the effect for overall play style. As expected, it was found that parents with an overall style of "Director" received higher prominence ratings for the director style than parents classified as "Facilitator" or "Director plus Facilitator", and that parents classified overall as "Facilitator" received higher prominence ratings for the facilitator style than parents classified as "Director" or "Director plus Facilitator". However, it also was found that parents classified overall either as "Director" or as "Facilitator" received higher prominence ratings for co-player than parents classified overall as "Director plus Facilitator". The latter result suggest that parents who did not use the director and facilitator styles together tended to add co-player to the style they used (whether it was director or facilitator).

Parental beliefs related to overall parental play styles

Analyses of variance were conducted on beliefs about the importance of social skills and play skills for two-year-old child, with overall play style(between-subjects) and parent sex(within-subjects) as factors. The result for overall play style was significant (F (2, 170) = 3.20, $p < .05$) in the analysis on social skills. Parents who were classified overall as "Director" rated social skills as more important for children (mean of 4.32 on a 5 point scale) than parents classified overall as "Facilitator" (mean of 3.99).

Parent play styles related to children's peer behavior

Differences in child behaviors during the observation of peer play in the Playgroup setting were examined as a function of the overall parent play style classification (Director, Facilitator, or Director plus Facilitator). The analyses (ANOVAs) were conducted separately for the overall play style classification

obtained from toy play and from physical play, and with parent sex as a within-subjects factor. There were several significant effects for overall play style. The results suggested (a) that if the overall play style of parents was Facilitator during physical play, children were higher on "enthusiasm/self-esteem", on "playfulness", and on "assertiveness" during peer play, and were more likely to play outdoors, (b) that if the overall play style of parents was Facilator during toy play, children were higher on "cheerfulness" during peer play, and were more likely to engage in pretend play, and (c) that if the overall play style of parents was Director during physical play, children were lower on "autonomy", and lower on "directing attention to the other while playing", during peer play. Finally, children were observed to engage in more simple repetitive actions during play if the overall style of fathers was Director and the overall style of mothers was not Director during physical play.

Discussion

Clear individual differences in parent-child play styles were found, and these could be described in terms of the general styles of "director", "facilitator" and "co-player", but the latter style was observed much less often. Parents tended to use a mixture of styles, although the combination of director plus facilitator was the most frequently observed combination. Some parents maintained a consistent single style (usually director or facilitator) throughout the period of play with their child.

The two play contexts (toy play and physical play) tended to involve different styles. The director style was observed more during physical play and the facilitator style more during toy play. The present findings linking parental play style with child play behavior (with both parents and with peers) appear generally to be consistent with previous studies showing aspects of child competence to be positively linked to facilitative-type parent behavior and negatively to director-type parent behavior (Biringen et al., 1994; Egeland, Pianta, & O'Brien, 1993; Jennings & Connors, 1989; Rose-Krasnor et al., 1996). There is a need, however, to consider the degree to which there are specific effects of experiencing these parental styles during play, especially the possibility that experience of these styles influence the child's play behavior with others.

The results presented here clarify the components of the general styles of director and facilitator through a comparison of the behavior of parents who did not use the style at all and those who used it predominantly. The findings provide a profile of a style that is essentially parent-centered (the director) and one that is child-centered (the facilitator). In the case of the "director", we found that parents who used this style were more likely to direct the child during the play, a finding consistent with the definition of the director style. Other aspects of the results, however, appear to have further clarify the director style. For example, parents who

used the style more were more interactive, and asked more questions. They also were less responsive to the child and showed less support for the child's autonomy and initiatives during the play.

There could have been some effect of parents using the director style on the behavior of the child during their play together, as children initiated less and were less responsive to parent initiatives if parents used the director style. Further, there was generally more conflict between parent and child if the parent used the director style. In this sense, the parent director style appeared to have direct consequences for the child's behavior. This is an important finding, suggesting that the use of the director style provides fewer opportunities for children to initiate during play, and that the experience of a directing parent leads children to be less positively oriented to the suggestions or initiatives of others during play. If these tendencies are transferred to interactions with peers, the child might be rated as less competent.

Parents who used the facilitator style only were less likely to lead or direct the child during play, and were more responsive to the child. The responsiveness included being positive in reactions to child initiations and to the child's autonomy. The facilitator style included being less interactive and asking fewer questions. Use of the facilitator style appeared to have direct consequences for the child in the sense that children of parents who used the facilitator style initiated more during the play and were more positive in response to the initiations that parents made. As might be expected, there was less conflict between parent and child if the parent used the facilitator style. Overall, therefore, the facilator style consisted of a collection of behaviors that could be described as "child-centered", in that they encouraged the child's "agenda" and behavior during the play, with an emphasis on being responsive to the child. The child's experience of this style seemed to promote both initiative and being positive to parents' suggestions during play. If these tendencies are transferred to play with peers, they would be considered as constructive and conducive to positive relationships.

The play style coded here as facilitative has been the focus of a number of parent training programs (e.g. Guerney, 1983; Webster-Stratton, 1987), and parents have rated this form of play as a difficult technique (Webster-Stratton, 1989). The present findings contribute to the further exposition of a facilitative style by detailing a number of specific parental behaviors that seem to be integral to the style. However, it is important to note that the overall style of facilitator also was associated with greater prominence ratings for the co-player style. It is possible that some of the links with child behavior, in play with parents and with peers, found here arose from the use of a combination of facilitative behaviors and co-player behaviors. This is a possibility that will be examined further in the present study as a larger sample becomes available.

Links were found between observed parental play style and the observed behavior and style of the child during peer play. There were associations between use of the facilitator style by parents and generally positive features in the observed behavior of the child (these children might be described as showing more fun in their play). For example, children with parents who used the facilitator style more appeared to have greater enthusiasm for and more confidence in peer play and interactions, and showed greater cheerfulness and playfulness. They also were somewhat more assertive, and these children played outdoors more often, and were more likely to engage in pretend play. In contrast, children of parents who used the director style more were less likely to pay attention to the other during peer play and displayed less autonomy in their play. Paying attention to the other in play (as rated here) has been considered an early indicator of cooperative play (Brownell & Brown, 1992; Howes, 1980).

At present, the processes by which play experiences with parents might have an impact on children's play with peers can only be speculated about. An important issues is whether parent-child play is associated with the acquisition of specific behaviors, competencies or attitudes that are transferred to the peer play context, or, whether the links suggested here might arise because parent play behaviors are simply an indication of more general relationship qualities. In the latter case, for example, a facilitative style during play might be indicative of a general style that is more responsive, and the consequences for the child could arise from the experience of the general relationship quality of responsiveness.

Finally, a feature of the results obtained here was the general absence of mother-father differences. With the present sample size, sex of child differences could not be tested, and it is possible that sex differences might arise if both sex of parent and sex of child differences could be tested. This is an issue that will be examined further when more data are available from a larger sample in the present study.

TABLE 1

GENERAL PARENTAL PLAY STYLES: RATES FOR PRESENCE AND PROMINENCE RANKING

	PRESENCE				PROMINENCE			
	Toy play		Physical play		Toy play		Physical play	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
DIRECTOR								
Mothers	.66	.36	.91	.20	.28	.34	.48	.37
Fathers	.66	.35	.83	.30	.35	.39	.45	.37
FACILITATOR								
Mothers	.95	.16	.85	.29	.76	.31	.52	.36
Fathers	.91	.20	.82	.29	.66	.37	.54	.35
CO-PLAYER								
Mothers	.20	.29	.28	.33	.04	.11	.07	.18
Fathers	.27	.33	.27	.34	.10	.24	.05	.13

TABLE 2

GENERAL PARENTAL PLAY STYLE: THEIR OBSERVED USE SINGLY AND IN COMBINATION

STYLE	1st min	mins 2-5	mins 6-9
Director only	12.7	7.4	7.5
Facilitator only	23.0	8.9	11.4
Coplayer only	0.5	0.5	0.0
Director plus facilitator	50.5	50.7	50.2
Director plus co-player	2.0	2.0	1.5
Facilitator plus co-player	7.4	8.9	10.4
All three styles	3.9	21.7	18.9

Note. These data are the percentage that each style or combination of styles was observed as present during each time segments. The results are combined for mothers and fathers, and for toy play and physical play.

TABLE 3

PLAY BEHAVIORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DIRECTOR STYLE

	Director not used		Director only		
Play Behavior	M	SD	M	SD	
Parent codes					
Parent play leads	1.70	.71	1.96	.87	ns
Parent play directives	1.16	.48	2.62	1.13	***
Parent responsiveness	3.51	.54	2.85	.73	***
Parent warmth[a]	5.22	.81	5.31	.68	ns
Parent interactiveness	3.32	.80	4.08	.69	***
Parent resp. child autonomy	3.57	.50	2.69	.79	***
Parent no. of questions	2.57	.96	3.46	.99	***
Parent clarity of questions	4.25	.70	3.88	.59	*
Parent overstimulation	1.00	.00	1.17	.38	ns
Parent responses to child initiations	4.88	.38	4.36	.93	***
Child codes					
Child enjoyment	4.13	.68	3.81	.90	ns
Child initiations	2.84	.88	1.58	.50	***
Child responses to parent initiations	4.59	.68	3.96	.94	**
Joint codes					
Mutual enjoyment	2.98	1.28	2.85	1.26	ns
Conflict	1.07	.26	1.65	.94	***

Note. df were generally 87, but were lower for some analyses due to missing data (e.g., a parent could not be coded for responses to child initiations if the child did not initiate).

[a] 7-point scale

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 4
PLAY BEHAVIORS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FACILITATOR STYLE

	Facilitator not used		Facilitator only		
Play Behavior	M	SD	M	SD	
Parent codes					
Parent play leads	2.13	.92	1.51	.62	***
Parent play directives	2.48	1.18	1.17	.52	***
Parent responsiveness	2.87	.72	3.45	.54	***
Parent warmth[a]	5.36	.66	5.06	.84	ns
Parent interactiveness	4.07	.68	3.21	.86	***
Parent resp. child autonomy	2.71	.74	3.62	.49	***
Parent no. of questions	3.26	1.06	2.58	.99	**
Parent clarity of questions	4.00	.63	4.19	.74	ns
Parent overstimulation	1.14	.36	1.00	.00	ns
Parent responses to child initiations	4.47	.84	4.86	.41	*
Child codes					
Child enjoyment	3.77	.92	4.02	.68	ns
Child initiations	1.64	.49	2.89	.89	***
Child responses to parent initiations	3.90	1.06	4.48	.77	*
Joint codes					
Mutual enjoyment	2.90	1.3	2.74	1.17	ns
Conflict	1.58	.89	1.09	.29	***

Note. df were generally 76, but were lower for some anaylses due to missing data (e.g., a parent could not be coded for responses to child initiations if the child did not initiate).

[a] 7-point scale

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 5
OVERALL PLAY STYLE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR MOTHERS AND FATHERS

	Toy play		Physical play	
	M	F	M	F
Director	4	9	11	13
Facilitator	27	26	8	10
Co-player	0	0	1	1
Director plus facilitator	17	12	24	20
Facilitator plus co-player	1	2	4	4
Director plus co-player	0	0	1	1
Not classifiable	5	4	6	5

References

Biringen, Z., Robinson, J., L., & Emde, R. N. (1994). Maternal sensitivity in the second year: Gender-based relations in the dyadic balance of control. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 64, 78-90.

Brownell, C. A., & Brown, E.. (1992). Peers and play in infants and toddlers. In V. B. van Hasselt and M. Hersen, (Eds.), Handbook of social development: A life-span perspective (pp. 183-200). New York: Plenum Press.

Burks, V. S., & Parke, R. D. (1996). Parent and child representations of social relationships: Linkages between family and peers. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 42, 358-378.

Egeland, B., Pianta, R., & O'Brien, M. A. (1993). Maternal intrusiveness in infancy and child maladaptation in early school years. Development and Psychopathology, 5, 359-370.

Goncu, A. (1987). The role of adults and peers in the socialization of play during the preschool years. In G. Casto, S. Ascione, & M. Salehi (Eds.), Current perspectives in infancy and early childhood research (pp. 33-41). Logan, UT: Early Intervention Research Institute Press.

Guerney, L. F. (1983). Introduction to filial therapy: Training parents as therapists. In P. A. Keller & L. G. Ritt (Eds.), Innovations in clinical practice: A sourcebook, (Vol. 2, pp. 26-39). Sarasota: Professional Resource Exchange.

Howes, C. (1980). Peer Play Scale as an index of complexity of peer interaction. Developmental Psychology, 16, 371-372.

Jennings, K. D., & Connors, R. E. (1989). Mothers' interactional style and children's competence at 3 years. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 12, 155-175.

MacDonald, K., & Parke, R. (1984). Bridging the gap: Parent-child play interaction and peer interactive competence. Child Development, 55, 1265-1277.

Mize, J., & Pettit, G. (1997). Mothers' social coaching, mother-child relationship style, and children's peer competence: Is the medium the message? Child Development, 68, 291-311.

O' Reilly, A. W., & Bornstein, M. H. (1993). Caregiver-child interaction in play. In M. H. Bornstein & A. W. O' Reilly (Eds.), The role of play in the development of thought. New Directions for Child Development, 59, 55-66.

Parke, R. D., Cassidy, J., Burks, & Carson (1992).

Parke, R. D., & Ladd, G. W. (1992). Family-peer relationships: Modes of linkage. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Parpal, M., & Maccoby, E. E. (1985). Maternal responsiveness and subsequent child compliance. Child Development, 56, 1326-1334.

Rae, G. (1984). On measuring agreement among several judges on the presence or absence of a trait. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44, 247-253.

Rose-Krasnor, L., Rubin, K. H., Booth, C. L., & Coplan, R. (1996). The relation of maternal directiveness and child attachment security to social competence in preschoolers. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 19, 309-325.

Russell, A. (1996). Peer-like features in parent-child relationships. Presented as part of a symposium entitled "Bidirectionality in parent-child relationships" (convened by S. Lollis and A. Russell). International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development conference, Quebec City.

Russell, A., Pettit, G., & Mize, J. (1996). Horizontal qualities in healthy parent-child relationships: Parallels with and possible consequences for children's peer relationships. (Draft manuscript).

Russell, A., & Russell, G. (1996). Positive parenting and boys' and girls' misbehavior during a home observation. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 19, 291-307.

Webster-Stratton, C. (1987). The parents and children series. Eugene, OR: Castalia

Webster-Stratton, C. (1989). Systematic comparison of consumer satisfaction of three cost-effective parent training programs for conduct problem children. Behavior Therapy, 20, 103-115.